



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,355	08/14/2003	William E. Sobel	SYMAP024	1616

35833 7590 03/01/2006

VAN PELT & YI LLP
10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD.
SUITE 200
CUPERTINO, CA 95014

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MERILYN P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2163

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/642,355

Applicant(s)

SOBEL, WILLIAM E.

Examiner

Merilyn P. Nguyen

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 August 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/31/2003</u> . | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Detailed Action</u> . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-29 are pending in this application.

Acknowledges

2. Receipt is acknowledged of the following items from the Applicant:
 - Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed October 21, 2003 have been made of record. The references cited on the PTOL 1449 form have been considered.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - The Summary of the Invention is missing at page 3.
 - Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

4. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9-12, 15, 24, 26-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1, 15, and 26-27, there are no given steps to arrive the method for rolling back an image or rolling back a computer state.

Regarding claim 15, 27 and 29, these claims are being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: steps in the body of the claims are not cooperative related to each other.

Regarding claims 3 and 5, the terms “image is a system” and “image is an application” are inconsistent with its true meaning.

Regarding claim 9, “evaluating a definition” is vague and indefinite.

Regarding claims 9-12, there is insufficient antecedent basis for “a method as recited in claim 1 wherein securing the roll-back state” since there is no “securing the roll-back state” step in claim 1.

Regarding claim 24, this claim is being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary

Art Unit: 2163

structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: devices/modules are not structural cooperative related to each other.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 1-23 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basic of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

(1) whether the claim is directed to a judicial exception (law of nature, natural phenomena, or an abstract idea) which would make it non-statutory if it is directed to the exception itself, rather than a practical application of the exception. One way a practical application can be established is through claiming a physical transformation (data transformation is not a physical transformation and is not, in and of itself, evidence of statutory subject matter).

(2) Where there is no physical transformation being claimed, a practical application would be established by a useful, concrete and tangible result. That result is useful if it has specific, substantial and credible utility. Make a determination whether such is the case based on the perspective of one of ordinary skill having read the claim in light of the disclosure. It's concrete if it produces an assured, repeatable result (e.g., same input produces the same output each time the steps are performed). For it to be a tangible result, it must be more than just a thought or a computation. Instead, it must have real world value rather than being an abstract result.

Art Unit: 2163

In the present case, claimed invention (Claims 1-23) merely recites the abstract idea of method for rolling back an image that does not apply, involve, use or advance the technological arts since all the recited steps can be performed in the mind of the user or by user of pencil and paper.

In the present case, claimed invention (Claims 28 and 29) does not produce tangible result since it includes **intangible media** such as **signals, carrier waves**, transmissions, optical waves, transmission media or other media incapable of being touched or perceived absent the tangible medium through which they are conveyed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-16 and 19-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Humlicek (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,744).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 26 and 28, Humlicek discloses a method, a computer program product for rolling back an image (See col. 8, line 1-59) comprising:

- determining a roll-back state (See col. 8, lines 5-7);
- configuring a current state to the roll-back state (See col. 8, lines 8-9); and

Art Unit: 2163

- determining whether the roll-back state is secure (See col. 8, lines 23-37).

Humlicek further discloses securing the roll-back state (See col. 8, lines 23-37) as per claim 2, 26 and 28.

Regarding claims 3-5, Humlicek discloses wherein the image is a system, a file or an application (See Fig. 2-5).

Regarding claim 6, Humlicek discloses wherein determining a roll-back state includes determining a non-infected state (See col. 8, lines 1-28).

Regarding claim 7, Humlicek discloses wherein configuring a current state to the roll-back state includes marking a first portion of a repository (See col. 8, lines 9-13 and col. 11, lines 2-7).

Regarding claim 8, Humlicek discloses wherein configuring a current state to the roll-back state further includes reverting a second portion of the repository (See col. 8, lines 33-38, and col. 11, lines 11-40).

Regarding claim 9, Humlicek discloses wherein securing the roll-back state further includes evaluating a definition in a repository providing data to the roll-back state (See col. 8, lines 29-33 and col. 11, lines 1-28).

Art Unit: 2163

Regarding claim 10, Humlicek discloses wherein securing the roll-back state further includes determining whether the definition is updated (See col. 8, lines 29-33 and col. 11, lines 21-41).

Regarding claim 11, Humlicek discloses wherein securing the roll-back state further includes retrieving an updated definition if the definition is not updated (See col. 8, lines 29-33 and col. 11, lines 20-28).

Regarding claim 12, Humlicek discloses wherein securing the roll-back state further includes installing the updated definition if the definition is not updated (See col. 8, lines 29-56).

Regarding claim 13, Humlicek discloses wherein configuring a current state to the roll back state further includes displaying a message (See col. 5, lines 26-28 and col. 6, lines 50- 61) and receiving a user input (See col. 6, lines 12-16).

Regarding claim 14, Humlicek discloses wherein configuring a current state to the roll-back state further includes using the user input to determine the roll-back state (See col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 7).

Regarding claims 15, 27 and 29, Humlicek discloses a method for rolling back a computer state comprising:

- scanning a repository (See col. 25, lines 40-55);
- leaving a marker in a first portion of the repository (See col. 11, lines 1-5);

Art Unit: 2163

- determining a safe state (See col. 11, lines 1-2);
- reverting the computer state to the safe state (See col. 10, line 67 to col. 11, line 2); and
- analyzing a second portion of the repository determined by the marker and the safe state (See col. 11, lines 20-28).

Regarding claim 16, Humlicek discloses wherein scanning the repository further comprises:

determining a version (See col. 8, lines 10-22 and col. 11, lines 2-5); and
updating the version if the version occurred prior to leaving the marker in the first portion of the repository (See col. 8, lines 29-33).

Regarding claims 19-21, Humlicek discloses wherein reverting the computer state to a safe state includes restoring a system/file/application to a previously non-infected version of the system/file/application (See col. 8, lines 1-28).

Regarding claim 22, Humlicek discloses wherein the first portion of the repository is non-reversible (See col. 11, lines 10-11).

Regarding claim 23, Humlicek discloses wherein the second portion of the repository is reversible (See col. 11, lines 1-6).

Art Unit: 2163

Regarding claim 24, Humlicek discloses a system for rolling back an image comprising:
a repository for storing data (See Fig. 2);
a scanner for determining a roll-back state (host devices 104, 106 for example, Fig. 1);
a protection module for configuring a current state to the roll-back state (volume manage
144, Fig. 2); and
a definition for securing the roll-back state (See col. 8, lines 29-38).

Regarding claim 25, Humlicek discloses a first portion of non-reversible memory for storing a marker; and a second portion of reversible memory for storing data related to the roll-back state. See Figs. 9-11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humlicek (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,744), in view of Liang (US 2003/0115483).

Regarding claim 17, Humlicek discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in claim 15. However, Humlicek is silent as to wherein determining a safe state includes searching for a virus. On the other hand, Liang teaches determining a safe state includes searching for a virus (See Fig. 5 and corresponding text, and paragraph [0026], Liang et al.). It

Art Unit: 2163

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to searching for a virus as suggested by Liang. The motivation would have been to securing the Humlicek system by finding and killing the virus so that images files free of infections.

Regarding claim 18, Humlicek discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in claim 15. However, Humlicek is silent as to evaluating a result of a vulnerability assessment. On the other hand, Liang teaches evaluating a result of a vulnerability assessment (See paragraph [0052], Liang et al.). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to evaluating a result of a vulnerability assessment. The motivation would have been to prevent the recurrence of virus spreading.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Watts U.S Patent No. 6,336,161 discloses computer configuration system and method with state and restoration from non-volatile semiconductor memory.

Stegelmann U.S Patent No. 6,772,155 discloses looking data in a database system.


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4026.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

Art Unit: 2163

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.


MN
February 16, 2006


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER